KHOWAR AND AREAL LINGUISTICS

Dr. Elena Bashir

American Pakistan Research Organization

Introduction

I have selected this topic in the hope that in this multi-disciplinary gathering it will raise points of interest to historians, geographers, and anthropologists, as well as to linguists. In addition to providing information on the areal affinities of Khowar, I hope it will serve as an example of how linguistic analysis can interact with historical studies.

The scope of areal linguistics

Areal linguistics concerns itself with questions of how the distribution of language features correlates with geographical position. Areal linguists deal with the practical and theoretical problems of distinguishing similarities among languages due to geographical proximity from those due to shared inheritance (having a common ancestor), those due to typological feature clustering or to language universals, and from those due to mere coincidence.

One important concept in areal linguistics is that of the sprachbund or linguistic area. In a classic paper (1956) Emeneau defines a linguistic area as "an area which includes languages belonging to more than one family but showing traits in common which are found not to belong to the other members of (at least one) of the families. South Asia is one of the better studied examples of a linguistic area. It includes languages belonging to the Dravidian, Munda (Austro-Asiatic), Indo-Aryan, Tibeto-Burman, and Iranian language families. Certain features, for example retroflex consonants, are common to all the languages of the contiguous area although they may not be found in other languages of some of the families. Farsi,

Acc. No -546

one of the major Iranian languages, does not have retroflex consonants.[1]

One of the basic methods employed by areal linguists is the geographical plotting of linguistic data in a way such that either "yes-no" presence or absence evaluations, or quantitative statements about the intensity of a feature's presence can be made. For example, if one is concerned with the question of retroflex consonants (like Urdu T and D, Khowar S and J, or Panjabi N)[2] he could note for each language or language variety either a + or - value, i.e. retroflex consonants are either present or absent. Or, he could note for each language the number of retroflex consonants present, either as an absolute number or as a percentage of the total number of consonant phonemes. Then he would be able to either (a) draw a boundary between the region having retroflex consonants and the region not having them, or (b) to establish a numerical gradient or continuum from a region having a higher percentage of retroflex consonants to a region having a lower percentage. Ramanujan and Masica (1969) have plotted the distribution of different classes of retroflexes, finding that certain retroflex consonants (T and D) are found all over South Asia, while retroflex sibilants (S and Z) and affricates (C and J) are found only in a strongly defined cluster of languages in the Hindu Kush and Karakorams. This cluster of languages includes Khowar, Kalasha, Shina, Burushaski, Yidgah, Wakhi, and Kohistani.

An quantified linguistic feature which exhibits a clear spatial gradient across language or language group boundaries is a strong candidate for an areally influenced feature. One study employing this methodology is that reported in Hook (1985). This

article reports the results of a survey covering the area from South India through parts of Sind and Baluchistan in Pakistan. Translation equivalents of a standard set of English sentences were elicited from a fairly large number of speakers over an extended geographical area which includes Dravidian, Indo-Aryan, and Iranian languages. The results are presented in terms of frequency of occurrence, expressed as a percentage, of the feature in question, namely the positioning of the subordinate clause relative to the main clause in the two sentences: 'Wait here until he gives you the letter' and 'I was afraid that you might give him the letter'. In the English sentences the order is main clause ('wait here') followed by subordinate clause ('until he gives you the letter'). Mapping of the percentage results shows a regular frequency change with distance, of the type argued above to be a clear indication of spatial factors as a causal element. In the southernmost part of India, where Dravidian languages are spoken, the subordinate clause preceded the main clause 100% of the time in both sentences (for Kannada, Tamil, Telugu, and Malayalam), while in the parts of Sind and Baluchistan surveyed by Hook 0% of the time (in Baluchi, Pashto, and Brahui). This result points to an areal effect such that decreasing proximity to the Dravidian-speaking core area and increasing proximity to the Iranian area correlated with decreasing frequency of subordinate clause preceding main clause. Conversely, increasing proximity to the Dravidian area correlated with a higher frequency of subordinate clause preceding main clause responses. This is particularly telling in the case of Brahui, genetically a Dravidian language but surrounded by western Indo-Aryan and Iranian languages.

Interestingly, Khowar did not fall within the scope of this survey. Had it done so, the results would have indicated that

Khowar (as does Kalasha) places the subordinate clause before the main clause significantly more than 0% of the time, quite frequently in fact. Consider the Khowar sentences hasé xató tá-te dika pat hayaa intizáar koré 'Wait here until he gives you the letter' in which the subordinate clause hasé xat-ó tá-te dika pat 'until he gives you the letter' precedes the main clause. This is the most common way of rendering this idea in Khowar. The sentence 'I was afraid that you might give him the letter' can be expressed in two ways in Khowar: awá buhtuáu oštám ki tu xató hatoGó-t doós, or tu xat-ó hatoGó-te doós reé buhtuáu oštám. In the first of these two alternate versions, the subordinate clauses follows the main clause, while in the second it precedes. The second version is considered a more indigenous Khowar construction, while the first an outside-influenced one. From this we see that in Khowar, the order subordinate, main seems to characterize an older, more intact stratum of the language, while the order main clause, subordinate reflects patterns introduced later.

Since Khowar is even more distant from the Dravidian area than Brahui and Pashto, this result indicates that Khowar is subject to the influence of some variable(s) other than the two poles--proximity to Dravidian and/or to Iranian--in terms of which the pattern in the Indo-Gangetic plains area was explained. What this other factor might be is discussed later in this paper.

The South Asian Linguistic Area

Masica (1976:187-90) identifies the following features as defining the South Asian linguistic area and having a distribution (almost) coincident with the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent.

(1) retroflex consonants (e.g. Urdu T, D)

(2) echo-words, in which a word is repeated with only a change in the initial consonant (e.g. Urdu cai vai 'tea and accompanying things')

(3) an enclitic particle (from Sanskrit api or Dravidian um which

functions as 'even' or 'also', indefinite 'and' (e.g. Urdu bhii Panjabi vii).

(4) pervasive use of the "dative subject" construction. "Dative subject construction" refers to an expression type in which the experiencer of emotions, bodily states, or afflictions receives a dative (or other oblique) case marker (e.g. Urdu ko or Panjabi nuu) rather than being the nominative case subject of the sentence. The following examples from Urdu illustrate the "dative subject" construction. mujhe Gussa aa rahaa hai 'I am getting angry', or mujhe sardii lagii 'I am feeling cold.' Notice that the experiencer of the emotion or sensation is expressed as mujhe rather than as nominative mai, and that typically the verb (in these examples aanaa 'come' and lagnaa 'to attach to') is intransitive.[3]

Masica also lists the following additional features which characterize the South Asian linguistic area but are not limited to it.

(5) exclusive use of suffixes rather than prefixes

(6) the use of two different stems in the personal pronominal system, (e.g. Sanskrit aham 'I' and ma- 'first person oblique stem' or English I 'I' and me 'me' (Emeneau 1958:112).

(7) the use of the same case morphemes with both singular and plural stems. For example, in Urdu we have both laRke-ko 'to the boy' and laRkõ-ko 'to the boys', the point being that the same morpheme ko 'to' occurs with both singular laRke and plural laRkõ.

(8) morphological causatives. For example, from Urdu karnaa 'to do' a causative form kar(w)aanaa 'to make some one do', 'to have something done' is created by morphological (word-forming) means rather than syntactically or analytically as is done in English, as in 'to have someone do', 'to make someone do', 'to get someone to do'.

(9) phonaesthetic (onomatopoetic) forms--either reduplicated or

ending in -k (e.g. Panjabi DàgaR DàgaR 'the sound of something heavy jumping or thumping').

(10) the extensive use of conjunctive participles to connect and sequence clauses. A conjunctive participle is a form like the Urdu kar-ke 'having done' or jaa-kar 'having gone'.

(11) the absence of a verb 'to have', so that possession is expressed with constructions in which the possessor is marked with the dative or genitive case (as in Urdu mere tiin bhai hãĩ 'I have three brothers' or mere paas das rupaye nahĩĩ 'I don't have ten rupees.'

(12) a constellation of word order features including basic subject, object, verb order of major sentence constituents; genitive, noun and adjective, noun order, and postpositional rather than prepositional phrases.

(13) the existence of compound verbs. A compound verb is a complex verb which consists of the stem or conjunctive participial form of the main verb plus a finite form of one of a small set of auxiliary or "vector" verbs. Urdu kar denaa 'to do (for someone)', kar lenaa 'to do (for self)', and mar jaanaa 'to die' are examples of compound verbs.

(14) In a later study (1982) Masica adds another feature, identified object marking, to the list of features characteristic of but not definitive of the South Asian Linguistic Area. To illustrate what is meant by identified object marking, consider the difference between the Urdu sentences mãĩ-ne billi dekhii 'I saw a cat', and mãĩ-ne billii-ko dekhaa 'I saw the cat'. In the first one the subject is unidentified, that is non-specific, and it appears in its direct or nominative case form. In the second sentence the cat referred to is a specific, identified one, and the noun billii 'cat' is marked with the Urdu ko, the dative/accusative marker.

Other areal affinities

As Masica himself has stressed, many of those features which are characteristic of but do not define the South Asian linguistic area are much more widely distributed. That is, features (5) - (14) are also found in areas outside of the South Asian subcontinent. The following list gives a brief indication of how widely some of these features are distributed.

Feature	Occurrence outside of South Asia
5. absence of prefixes	Altaic
6. two stems in personal pronouns	Indo-European
7. identical case morphemes for singular and plural stems	Altaic, Uralic
8. morphological causatives	Iranian, Altaic, Uralic
9. phonaesthetic forms	Austroasiatic
10. conjunctive participles	Altaic, Uralic, Russian, Japanese, Korean
11. absence of verb 'have'	Altaic, Uralic, Russian, Arabic, Ethiopic
12. word order features	Altaic, Tibeto-Burman, Iranian, Uralic, Ethiopic, Altaic
13. compound verbs	Altaic, Iranian or Central Asia, Japanese, Korean, Chinese, Burushaski
14. identified object marking	Altaic (particularly Turkic), Persian, Ossetic

Notably, it can be seen that many of the features found in South Asia also characterize Central Asia. For this reason, Masica and others have been lead to postulate a larger"Indo-Turanian" area, commonalities within which would suggest language contact and interaction of long standing and at a very great time depth.

It seems clear that given the vast extent of the Central Asian/ South Asian macro-area and the small number of definitive features for the South Asian linguistic area, it will be helpful to define

sub-areas within the macro-area.

One such putative sub-area is a Central Asian Linguistic Union, a configuration proposed by the Soviet scholar Edelman (1980). Edelman finds that the languages of the Hindu Kush, Pamirs, Karakorams and part of the Himalayas share certain features which she attributes to substratal influences.[4] Among these are:

(1) retroflex sibilants and affricates, which are characteristic of Burushaski but not of most Indo-Aryan languages.

(2) the construction of the numerals from 11-20, which follow the pattern 10 + n rather than the inherited Indo-Aryan n + 10 pattern.

(3) word-formation patterns (e.g. in Wakhi) analogous to prefixal Burushaski patterns.

(4) the treatment of some semantically intransitive verbs, like 'to laugh', 'to cough', 'to weep' as transitives, which she associates with the (partial) acquisition of "active" characteristics.

(5) a change from grammatical to semantic gender based on animacy.

(6) obligatory affixal elements with inalienably possessed entities (like body parts, or kinship terms), presumably under the influence of Burushaski.

Khowar vis-a-vis the South Asian Linguistic Area

Let us now examine the extent to which Khowar exhibits the features of the South Asian Linguistic Area.

(1) retroflex consonants. Khowar has eight pairs of consonants which are distinguished by the opposition dental-retroflex or palatal-retroflex. They are t/T, d/D, th/Th, c/C, ch/Ch, j/J, s/Ş, z/Ẓ. Of these, five pairs involve retroflex sibilants and affricates, which are characteristics of the Dardic area rather than South Asia as a whole. Phonetically, the retroflex stops T, D, and Th are closer to

alveolars than to the "true" retroflexes of Dravidian. Thus, although Khowar does participate in the larger retroflex consonants region, its possession of retroflex sibilants and affricates is the more salient characteristic.

(2) Echo words. Echo-words are freely used in Khowar. The second, echo component begins in m- following the Farsi and Pashto pattern, e.g. cei-mei 'tea and related things'. In Khowar, echo words can be constructed on nouns, on infinitives, e.g. kosik-mosik 'to walk/roam around' (cf. Urdu calnaa phirnaa); on the conjunctive participial form of the verb (kosi mosi goósi 'we will walk/roam around and then come' (cf. cal phir-ke aẽnge); and on the imperfective participial form kosáu-mosáu boGáutani 'They used to go to roam around'; and with adjectives loT moT darán chiné 'Cut the (relatively) larger logs'. Thus in Khowar the distribution of these echo-forms is wider than it is in Urdu, for example.

(3) Enclitic 'also'. Khowar employs the particle -di in a manner analogous to Sanskrit api, Dravidian um, and Urdu bhii, in the sense of 'also'. awá-di biman 'I am also going'.

(4) Dative subject. With regard to the "dative subject" construction, Khowar participates to a certain extent in this pattern in its general sense. Expressions of the form ma oráaru góyan 'I am feeling sleepy'fit the typical dative-subject pattern in that the experiencer is encoded with an oblique form and the verb is intransitive. On the other hand a class of very common expressions like ma Chúi areér 'I feel hungry' (lit. 'Hunger has done to me.') or uSák kóyan '(I) am feeling cold' (lit. 'cold is doing to me') involve the transitive verb korik 'do' instead of an intransitive.

Now let us turn to those features which do characterize the South Asian Linguistic Area but extend beyond it.

(5). Prefixes. Khowar makes significant use of prefixes. First,

i

it has an important set of preverbs. For example: yoór yii nisá̀i 'The sun rose', and yoór áf Geritai 'The sun set' in which the elements yii and af 'upwards' and 'downwards' respectively are directional preverbs. Secondly, Khowar employs a prefixing reduplicative process in at least two functions: pluralization and intensification. For example, from tseq 'small' we have tsetseq 'small ones or children' in which the reduplication indicates pluralization. If with adjectives the vowel of the reduplicated syllable is elongated, the resulting reduplicated form indicates an intensive meaning, for example from loT 'big' we have loóloT 'very big'.[5] In its employment of prefixal mechanisms, thus, Khowar differs from the South Asian pattern.

6. Two pronominal stems. In the first person singular, Khowar employs different stems for the nominative and the oblique cases: awá in the nominative and ma in the oblique.

7. Case-marking morphemes. Khowar's system is mixed. There are only two basic inflectional endings other than the nominative--an oblique and an instrumental. The singular oblique ends in -o and the plural oblique in -an. The instrumental ending -en attaches to both singular and plural nouns. For other case relations postpositions are employed. These govern the oblique form of the noun, but are themselves invariable. For example: kitábo the book kitá-te doóm 'I will give it to you (sg.)' kitában pisá-te doóm 'I will give the books to you.' or kumóro-sáar kitábo gané 'Take the book from the girl.' and kumorán-an saar kitában gané 'Take the books from the girls'.

8. Morphological causatives. In contrast to Urdu and many other South Asian languages, which have two layers of causative morphology, Khowar has only one layer. Thus Urdu has sets of forms like pakna 'to ripen, get cooked', pakaanaa 'to cook (trans.)' and pakwaanaa

'to have cooked, to have someone cook'. As in: cawal pak gaye hai 'The rice is cooked.' us-ne cawal pakaae 'He cooked the rice'. us-ne khansaame-se cawal pakwaae 'He got the rice cooked by the cook.' In Khowar, however, from poçik 'to ripen, get cooked', we have one derived causative paceḗik, which serves as both derived transitive and "true causative". Thus awá pušúran paceḗitam 'I cooked the (pieces of) meat' and awá hoó Cakeéi pušúran paceéitam 'I got him to cook the (pieces of) meat'.

9. Phonaesthetic forms. Khowar has some phonaesthetic forms involving reduplication, e.g. thrisku-thrásku 'the sound of rustling or scraping'. Notice that this form involves a stem-vowel change rather than simple reduplication. Also, reduplication is employed in many other words in which the iconic relationship is not a simple imitation of a natural sound. For example: TungTáng 'a ~~cloud of dust~~' sesheér 'a fit of weeping'.

10. Conjunctive participles. Khowar makes extensive use of conjunctive participles to link and sequence clauses. For example, the following sentence is from a story text. diti hatétan hatá jindáan yii gani tan bareéi kištio góL-o dreé rahi areér 'After giving it, he picked up their patchwork (begging) garments, put them on himself, put the begging bowl around his neck and set out.' In this example, the forms yii gani, bareéi, and dreé are all conjunctive participles, and there is only one finite verb, rahi areér. A language like English, on the other hand, uses a finite verb for each of the actions reported in the sequence.

11. Absence of 'have'. Khowar agrees with the South Asian areal pattern in this feature. To indicate inalienable possession, the oblique form of the noun denoting the possessor is used followed by existential 'be'. For example: ma troi žurgíni asúni 'I have three daughters.' (Lit. 'My three daughters are.') To indicate

alienable possession a locative postpositional expression is employed, e.g. ta sum macis šéni-aá 'Do you have any matches?' (Lit. 'With you are there any matches?'

12. Word-order features. Khowar shares the same cluster of word-order features that characterize the South Asian Linguistic Area--subject, object, verb order of main constituents, genitive noun, and adjective noun, and postpositional word order.

13. Compound verbs. Khowar appears to form a limited number of compound verbs. I have so far been able to identify compound verbs formed with the vectors bik 'go', laáki 'release, let go', and nišik 'sit'. For example, alongside the simple formation tu puluis 'You will get burned.' we have tu pului bis 'You will get burned'. We have the simple sentence paloóGan bezemítam 'I sold the apples' as well as the compound verb formation e.g. thùu paloóGan bezemi laákitam. 'Alas, I sold the apples (by mistake).' Use of the vector laákik 'to let go, release' conveys a sense of regret at having made a mistake. Illustrating the use of nišik 'sit' as a vector, we have a sentence like this: hasé boók-o laáki-nišaái 'He divorced his wife (the action has been completed)! The vector nišik contributes a sense of finality and completion.[6]

But in Khowar these constructions appear infrequently, in contrast to their pervasiveness in Indo-Aryan languages like Urdu or Panjabi and Dravidian languages like Telugu or Tamil. Therefore we must say that Khowar participates but weakly in this feature.

14. Identified object marking. Khowar distinguishes between identified and non-identified objects regularly. For example, corresponding to the Urdu examples above, we have: awá ~~dog~~ reéni poší asùm 'I have seen a cat (i.e. I have had the experience of seeing a/any ~~dog~~).' and awá ta ~~dog~~ réni-o posi asùm 'I have seen your ~~dog~~ (a specific identified ~~dog~~). Thus Khowar possesses the identified object marking feature

strongly.

Khowar vis-a-vis the Central Asian Linguistic Union

Now let us see the extent to which Khowar possesses the characteristics of the putative Central Asian Linguistic Union.

1. Retroflex sibilants and affricates. Khowar possesses a full set of these--the phonemes /C/, /Ch/, /S/, /Z/, /J/.

2. Numerals. The Khowar numerals from 11-20, as do those of Kalasha, Yidgah, Wakhi, Burushaski, Balti and other Tibeto-Burman languages, and Iranian languages of the Shugni-Roshani group, are formed on the pattern 10 + n, rather than the inherited Indo-Aryan pattern of n + 10, e.g. Khowar još ponj '15'.

3. prefixal word-formation patterns. Khowar's directional preverbs are distinct from systems in the plains languages, but they seem to group more with languages like Kalasha and the Nuristani languages, especially Prasun, which has an elaborate set of directional prefixes,[7] than with Burushaski.

4. Transitive treatment of intransitives. This characteristic cannot be observed in Khowar, since Khowar, which has a nominative-accusative case-marking system, treats transitives and intransitives alike.

5. Semantic gender. Khowar, as does Kalasha, displays the change from grammatical gender to semantic gender based on animacy. This is manifested in the use of two separate forms of the verb 'be'--asik for animates and šik for inanimates. Since these verbs serve as auxiliaries in many complex verb tenses, the distinction pervades the verbal system.

6. Obligatory affixal elements with inalienably possessed entities, like body parts or kinship terms. Khowar does not have this characteristic.

One highly important characteristic of Khowar not previously considered is its possession of the grammaticized verbal category of inferentiality. This category, under which are grammaticized distinctions between direct and hearsay knowledge as well as between old and newly-acquired knowledge does not exist in any of the languages of the Indo-Gangetic plain, that is, does not exist at all in the South Asian Linguistic Area. In both Khowar and Kalasha this category is highly developed. For example, in Khowar, the two sentences hes kitáp nivesák '(S)he is a writer' and hes kitáp nivesák biraái '(I have just found out that) (s)he is a writer' carry different meanings. The former signifies that the information is old knowledge for the speaker, already well-integrated into his personal knowledge structure, while the latter indicates that it is something he has just learned. In order to indicate such distinctions in languages like Urdu, or English, one has to employ a separate phrase or clause, like mujhe abhii pata calaa hai ki or it turns out that, it seems that.

This category is strongly grammaticized in most of the languages of Central and Eastern Asia--the Turkic, Finno-Ugric, Samoyedic, Tungus, and Caucasian languages, Indo-European languages in contact with Turkish, like Bulgarian, and in the Kuristani language Waigali (see Buddruss (1987:33-4, 37-8).[8]

In possessing this category, Khowar participates in another, yet larger areal configuration--one including all of Central and Eastern Asia, and parts of eastern Europe.

One other characteristic of Khowar--the left-branching structural relationship between subordinate and main clause (recall the discussion of the sentences 'Wait here until he gives you the letter' and 'I was afraid that you might give him the letter' in which it was pointed out that in Khowar the order with subordinate clause pre-

ceding the main clause is at least as common if not more so, than the order with main clause preceding the subordinate clause) points to Khowar's participation at great time depth in the large left-branching area including Central Asia and Eastern Asia.

Summary

The following table summarizes what has been said about Khowar's areal characteristics so far.

South Asian Linguistic Area Feature	Status of Khowar
1. Retroflex consonants	✓
2. Echo words	+
3. Enclitic 'also'	+
4. "Dative subject"	✓
5. Absence of prefixes	-
6. Two pronominal stems	✓
7. Identical case markers	✓
8. Morphological causatives	✓
9. Phonaesthetic forms	✓
10. Conjunctive participles	+
11. Absence of 'have'	+
12. Word order features	+
13. Compound verbs	✓
14. Identified object marking	+
"Central Asian Linguistic Union" **Feature**	
1. Retroflex sibilants and affricates	+
2. Numeral structure	+
3. Prefixal patterns	✓
4. Transitive treatment of intransitives	N.A.
5. Semantic gender	+
6. Obligatory affixes for inalienable possession	-
Larger Eurasian Areas	
1. Inferentiality	+
2. Left-branching structures	✓

Key: + - strong presence of feature
✓ - partial or mixed manifestation
- - absence of feature
N.A.- not applicable

As can be seen, Khowar participates in at least three levels of areal association. None of these areal relationships is unambiguous or exclusive. What they seem to indicate is successive layers of historical structural accretion in the language. The

largest scale and oldest pattern in which Khowar participates is the extensive left-branching area including Altaic, Tibeto-Burman, Burushaski, and the Dravidian languages. The next largest area is that of northern Eurasia--the area in which the category of inferentiality is grammaticized. Khowar's sharing of this feature today must be due to a long-standing period of interaction with languages possessing that feature, probably Turkic. The next historical layer is that represented by the features clustered under what is called the "Central Asian Linguistic Union". It is possible that Burushaski is the source of some of those features. Finally, and reflecting most recent historical associations, is Khowar's partial assimilation to the South Asian Linguistic Area.

I hope that this exercise, in addition to providing some facts about Khowar, will serve as an example of how the comparative analysis of the grammatical and phonological properties of a language can also yield information about the history of the linguistic influences on it. Many people are aware of how the study of individual words and their sources can interact with the study of history. Thus areal linguistics can provide information to complement written historical records when they are available, and it provides tools for learning about the past of a language and its speakers in the absence of written records.

Notes

1. The Balkan area is another well-documented example of a sprachbund. It includes languages from the Greek, Albanian, Italic, and Slavic branches of Indo-European and some dialects of Turkish, and the traits common to the sprachbund area are not common to the other members of the Slavic or Italic branches, or to other dialects of Turkish.

2. In this paper retroflex consonants are represented by capital letters, except in the case of L, which represents the velarized or "dark" "l" sound of Khowar, and of G, which represents the voiced velar spirant (ɣ). Long vowels are represented by gemination of the vowel letter. Stress is indicated on the vowel of the stressed syllable.

3. Heston (1980) has pointed out that echo words are also found in Iranian languages, e.g. Tajik and Persian and Ossetic, and in a 1983 paper has added that "dative-subject" constructions can be found in modern and classical Persian and thus should not be considered diagnostic for the South Asian Linguistic Area.

4. Substratal influences means the influence of an earlier language upon one which is acquired later. For example, the construction mai-ne jaanaa in Urdu is considered to be a substratal influence of Panjabi on Urdu. In this case the language possibly exerting substratal effects may be Burushaski.

5. It is worth noting in this connection that Turkish employs a similar prefixal process in forming intensive adjectives and adverbs, e.g. beyaz 'white' and bembeyaz 'completely white' (Kornfilt 1987:629)

6. The semantics of the Khowar and Kalasha compound verbs is discussed in detail in Bashir 1988:210-251.

7. These have been described by Buddruss in a lecture

8. See Haarmann (1970) for a detailed monograph on this subject.

References

Bashir, Elena. 1988. Topics in Kalasha Syntax: An Areal and Typological Perspective. University of Michigan Ph.D. Dissertation. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms.

Buddruss, Georg. 1987. "Ein Ordal der Waigal-Kafiren des Hindukusch". in Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure 41. 1987. Cahier dédié à Georges Redard. Genève: Librairie Droz.

Edelman, Dzhoi. 1980. "K substratnomu nasledidju tsentralnoasiatskogo jazykogo sojuza". Voprosy jazykoznanija. 5:21-32.

Emeneau, Murray B. 1956. "India as a Linguistic Area". Language 32:3-16.

Haarmann, Harald. 1970. Die indirekte Erlebnisform als grammatische Kategorie: Eine Eurasische Isoglosse. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Heston, Wilma L. 1980. "Some Areal Features: Indian or Irano-Indian". International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics. 9.1:141-57.

_____. 1983. "What Linguistic Area: An Iranianist's View". paper presented at 1983 American Association of Asian Studies annual meeting, held in San Francisco.

Hook, Peter Edwin. 1985. "Linguistic Areas: getting at the grain of History". in Festschrift for Henry Hoenigswald. ed. George Cardona and Norman H. Zide. Tubingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1987. "Turkish and the Turkic Languages", in Comrie, Bernard. The World's Major Languages. New York: Oxford University Press.

Masica, Colin P. 1976. Defining a Linguistic Area. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

_____. 1976-b. "Another Typological Feature Common to South

and Central Asian Languages: Identified Object Marking". South Asia 2: Proceedings of the 30th International Congress of Human Sciences in Asia and North Africa (1976). ed. Daciela de la Lama. Mexico, 20 D.F.: El Colegio de Mexico.

Ramanujan, A. K. and Marica, Colin. 1969. "Toward a Phonological Typology of the Indian Linguistic Area". In Current Trends in Linguistics. 5. pp. 543-77.